

REMARKS

Claims 10-21 remain pending in the application with the present amendments. In the Office Action, all claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,860,083 to Sukegawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,379 to Zeryck et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,480 to Pleso ("Pleso"). For the reasons set forth below, applicant respectfully submits that the presently pending claims are fully distinguished from the art cited by the Examiner.

Applicant submits that the amendments submitted herein do not raise new issues, but rather merely place the application in better condition for appeal. Accordingly, the amendments herein are enterable in the application after the final Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now allowable over the cited reference in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Office Action failed to address one of the elements recited in each of the independent claims 10, 13 and 16, namely that each of the portions of the software data contains driver data corresponding to one of a plurality of computing environments, and, as recited in claim 10, the output unit is operable to output *the portion of the software data that corresponds* to the respective computer operating environment of main equipment to which the electronic device is attached. While the subject matter covered by the independent claims is not changed by the present amendment, each of these claims now recites this feature more forcefully in terms of portions of software driver data "each corresponding to a *specific* computer environment selected from a plurality of different *specific* computer operating environments", in which the portion of software driver data selected for output is that which

corresponds to the specific computer operating environment of the main equipment or main apparatus.

The Office Action cited *Pleso* as teaching this feature. However, *Pleso* neither teaches nor suggests a plurality of portions of software data in which each such portion corresponds to a different specific computer operating environment. Instead, *Pleso* merely describes providing just one driver (col. 8, lns. 49-55) which is "both processor and operating system independent." col. 14, lns. 28-30. Surely, selecting a portion of driver data for output which corresponds to a selected one of a plurality of specific computer operating environments as recited by applicant's claims cannot be equated with outputting the same driver every time regardless of the operating system, as described in *Pleso*.

In addition, applicant maintains that claims 11-12, 14-15 and 17-21 recite additional distinguishing features over the art cited in the Office Action for the reasons set forth in applicant's amendment dated February 2, 2006.

Support for the present amendments is provided, *inter alia*, at paragraphs [0027], [0049]-[0051] and FIGS. 4 and 5.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 09/925,234

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-196

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 4, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By



Daryl K. Neff

Registration No.: 38,253

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

679626_1.DOC